

**REMARKS**

The amendment filed July 21, 2004, in listing the claims, inadvertently overlooked an amendment to claim 2 which was made during the international phase on June 16, 2000. Claim 2 was then amended as follows

The compound of claim 1, wherein R20 is -CH<sub>2</sub>X,  
wherein X is phenyl.

This is evident from comparison of claim 2 as it appears in the IPER with claim 2 as it appears in the international application as filed.

In the listing of claims, claim 2 is amended to conform to its wording on June 16, 2000. We have labeled claim 2 as "amended" even though it could be characterized as "previously presented".

The amendment of claim 2 does not add new matter. Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1 and it states in claim 2 that R20 is phenyl. According to claim 1, R20 cannot represent phenyl. It would be clear therefore to the skilled person that a mistake has occurred in claim 2.

From a comparison of the preferred peptide sequence, it would be entirely clear to the skilled person that the amino acid residue of which R20 is a part is most preferably Phe. In such a case, R20 would be benzyl. (See, for example, claims 5, 9 and the compounds listed in claim 10.) In claim 1, this preferred option is covered when R20 is -CH<sub>2</sub>X, wherein X is aryl.

It is asserted therefore that it would be entirely clear to the skilled person that claim 2 should in fact state that "R20

USSN - 09/674,733

is -CH<sub>2</sub>X, wherein X is phenyl". In this way, R20 would represent the preferred group, i.e. benzyl.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

Iwer P. Cooper  
Reg. No. 28,005

624 Ninth Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Telephone: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile: (202) 737-3528  
IPC:lms  
G:\ipc\n-q\Plou\Szardenings1\pto suplamendment.wpd